UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/625,363	07/23/2003	Ramarathnam Venkatesan	MS1-1285US	8229

22801 7590 12/10/2007

LEE & HAYES PLLC
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER	
GEE, JASON KAI YIN	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2134	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/10/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	**Application No.** 10/625,363	**Applicant(s)** VENKATESAN ET AL.	
	Examiner Jason K. Gee	**Art Unit** 2134	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 21 November 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on th e same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notic e of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
   a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
   b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
   Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avo id dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the dat e of filing a brief, will not be entered because
   (a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
   (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
   (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
   (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally r ejected claims.
   NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL -324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
   The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
   Claim(s) allowed: _____.
   Claim(s) objected to: _____.
   Claim(s) rejected: _____.
   Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final acti on, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____.

KAMBIZ ZAND
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The amendments add new limitations that will require further search and consideration. The appellant has requested that finality be withdrawn because of an incorrect 112 rejection. However, the finality will be maintained, as the art applied still teaches all the claims. As for the 102 rejection, the appellant argues the same thing as she argued in the interview. The appellant argues that Pintsov does not teach wherein calculations that generate the one or more codes do not employ M2 and M2 cannot be derived form these calculations of one or more codes. However, this is taught by Pintsove, as shown in the art rejection. The calculations of Pintsov's message does not use the first portion, it uses the encrypted portion, which is then hashed. As well known to anyone in the art, a hash is a one way function, and the original message may not be reversed. Also, as taught in the applicant's specification, a hash function is used. The appellant also argues claim 7, and argues that Pintsov does not teach all the limitations. There are no limitations of q, as it is just a variable, and therefor e, g is a fixed element of order q in a fixed group, as q can be anything. Also, Pintsov also teaches throughout the reference that the hash functions are determined, and they are not random. These hash functions are keyed versions of secure hash functio ns. As per claims 5 and 6, and that they are not obvious. However, as seen in Pintsov, in paragraphs 6 and 7, the invention is geared toward increasing speed by reducing complexity by making the amount of bits less. This is also shown in paragraph 9. One way Pintsov does this is through hashing, which inherently makes messages to a fixed length. This was also discussed in the interview as well. Thus, since messages are usually longer than hashed version, it would have been obvious to do so. This wou ld not happen if the messages were very short (very few bits), and it is rarely the case that a hash is larger than the original message. The appellant also argues that M2 has a defined length, and argues that Pintsov does not teach this, as it states tha t the sizes of its portions are relative and determined by the application. A relative length is still a 'defined' length, and the lengths are defined and determined based on the application. The appellant continues to argue claim 7, which was also discussed in the interview. The appellant believes that the same assignee does not teach the same thing, because the references concatenates two variables. However, the claimed invention just claims using the two variables, and thus, the reference teach all the limitations of the claims. Also, the appellant argues that the reference does not teach that the variable 'r' is related to M1 and M2. However, these are just variable changes, and r is part of a message in the reference, and therefore, it applies. S ince the formula is being applied to different variables, M1 and M2 do apply. The appellant also argues that there is no reason to combine the references. However, the reasons are stated in the art rejections, and it would be obvious to try to implement other equations that are known in the art. .